



AD HOC WORK GROUP

HENRY HAGG LAKE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Meeting No. 3 Summary

Meeting Date: September 12, 2002

I. MEETING ATTENDEES

AHWG Members:

**denotes attendance at third AHWG meeting;*

***denotes new member or alternate*

*Ric Balfour, PUMP
Paul Billick, U.S. Coast Guard
Dick Caldwell, ODFW
**George Dallas, Adjacent Landowner
*Herb Doumitt, OR Bass & Panfish Club
*Andy Duyck, WACO Board of Comm.
*Scott Diamond, OR Road Runners Club
Al Julian, Marine Patrol
**Chuck Kingston, Joint Water Commission
*Kathi Larson, USFWS
*Gary Myers, NW Outdoor Science School

*Jim Olson, Mazamas
*Wally Otto, Tualatin Valley Irrigation District
Wayne Shuyler, Oregon Marine Board
Mark Sytsma, Center for Lakes & Reservoirs
*Steve Seely, WACO Parks & Rec. Advisory Board
Josh Smith, Gaston Fire Department
**Don VandeBergh – ODFW
*Tom VanderPlatt, Clean Water Services
*Chris Wayland, WACO Parks
*Ray Wold, Oregon Equestrian Trails
*Tom Wolf, Trout Unlimited & Tualatin River Watershed Council

Planning Team:

*Carolyn Burpee Stone, Reclamation
*Jeff Reavis, Reclamation
*Patti Llewellyn, Reclamation
*Karen Blakney, Reclamation
*Ron Eggers, Reclamation
*Larry "Zak" Zakrajsek, Reclamation

*Tanya Sommer, Reclamation
*Kevin Butterbaugh, EDAW
*Jim Keany, EDAW
*Peter Carr, EDAW
*John Petrovsky, JPA Associates

Other Participants

*David Mayfield, URS

II. INTRODUCTION

John Petrovsky (JPA) opened the meeting with a round of Planning Team and AHWG member introductions; he noted that the goals of today's meeting are to gather AHWG comments on: (1) the set of recently developed draft Goals and Objectives for the RMP effort, and (2) the drafted, preliminary alternatives. Copies of these drafts were sent to AHWG members prior to the meeting for their review.

John summarized what RMP-related actions have occurred since the last AHWG meeting, which include finalizing the list of issues/opportunities, finalizing the Problem Statement, drafting the Goals and Objectives, drafting the preliminary set of RMP alternatives, preparing and mailing Newsbrief #2, updating the RMP website, and meeting with ODFW to discuss the status and intent of the elk meadows.

Note: There were no AHWG comments on the previous meeting summary.

III. DRAFT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Kevin Butterbaugh began the discussion of the draft Goals & Objectives, which were developed primarily from previous AHWG input, public input, discussions among the Planning Team, Reclamation, and initial findings of the resource inventory. In most cases, it is envisioned that the goals will remain unchanged. The objectives, however, are a bit more fluid, changing throughout the process based mostly on Planning Team and AHWG input. Additional input from AHWG members is summarized below, organized by resource category. Note: only objectives that generated comments or discussion are listed below.

Natural Resources (NAT)

Wildlife and Vegetation Management

- **NAT 1.4** – Chuck Kingston (JWC) noted that the objective should also include invasive/non-native bivalves/mollusks (such as zebra mussels).
- **NAT 1.6** – The double asterisk (**) will be removed from this Objective, indicating that this applies to all of the alternatives. Don VandeBergh noted that birding and other non-consumptive wildlife watching are an important and growing use for citizens; this use must be acknowledged & managed for at Henry Hagg Lake.

Fishery Resources

- **Nat 2.1** – It was noted that the objective should be clarified to read it is applicable to the reservoir fishery.

Water Quality

- **NAT 3.5** – Chuck Kingston recommended that the Objective text be broadened to encompass all activities that could affect water quality, not just construction-related activities. Other activities with the potential to affect water quality include boating, which can introduce motor oil; adjacent land use practices that use herbicides or pesticides; etc. The Planning Team agreed but noted that Reclamation's jurisdiction is limited to lands within the RMP study area boundary.

Erosion

- **NAT 4.2** – The group discussed the use of woody debris to add shoreline structure/stabilization. It was noted that any woody debris placed for structure needs to be securely anchored so it wouldn't float away (and become a boating/safety hazard or interfere with dam operations). Riprap was raised as a possible alternative, and the Planning Team agreed to

look into other such actions; Kathi Larson (USFWS) expressed her preference to minimize use of riprap. An overall comment noted that any shoreline stabilization projects needed to be well designed, with potential problems and/or impacts considered and addressed.

Cultural Resources (CUL) and Indian Sacred Sites (ISS)

Although no Objective-specific issues were discussed, a general question was raised for cultural resources and Indian sacred sites. Regarding cultural resources, what type of cultural resource inventories have been conducted on lands in the RMP study area? Carolyn Burpee Stone (Reclamation) noted that a Class I cultural resource survey was conducted in conjunction with the 1994 Recreation Plan; an additional site was later looked at on the Peninsula being proposed for use as an Education/Research Center. No surveys have been conducted on remaining lands, but site-specific surveys would be required prior to any future ground-disturbing activities. (Planning Team Note: In addition to the Class I records search noted at the meeting, ground surveys have been completed on all proposed development or enhancement areas, except elk meadows, and no eligible sites have been found.) Regarding sacred sites, are there any on Reclamation lands? Carolyn noted that none have been identified by the Tribes, but that the Tribes frequently do not tell the agencies what/where sacred sites are located. A group discussion followed about the need to prove the validity of any sacred site claim before management actions or mitigation measures are implemented. [Note: Reclamation is required to comply with requirements of Executive Order 13007 regarding Sacred Sites.]

Recreation (REC)

Land-based Recreation

- **GOAL REC1**– Larry “Zak” Zakrajsek (Reclamation) asked if a maximum capacity/use analysis had been completed for Henry Hagg. Chris Wayland (WACO) responded that a specific study has never been undertaken, but that the reservoir and surrounding lands have supported up to 19,000 people at one time, and that numbers in the range of 10-12,000 are not uncommon. Kevin Butterbaugh added that the 1999 user survey addressed capacity issues, including perceptions of crowding.
- **REC 1.5** – Zak noted that “and County” should be added to “Reclamation’s concession policy.”
- **REC 1.7** – The Group discussed this asterisked Objective at length. At issue was the appropriateness of providing camping facilities at the park, clearly one of the most controversial elements of the RMP process. The pros and cons have been well-documented in previous materials. Most Group members present appear to strongly oppose providing camping for such reasons as noise, user conflicts, fire hazard, safety and enforcement, natural resource degradation, conflicts with the environmental learning center, and disturbance to area residents. On the other side, there is a complete lack of camping facilities in the county and a clear demand for such facilities; campgrounds have been designed and managed well in neighboring areas with similar concerns. In addition, camping would provide a revenue source for the County to pay for implementation of some of the other RMP actions since they are not subsidized for the costs of operating the Park. It would also make the County eligible for grant money, which they cannot apply for at the present time.

Access

- **GOAL REC4** – Chuck Kingston noted that, due to the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the subsequent Homeland Security measures, an Objective should be added here to address access and security to dam facilities. Dam access will certainly be limited and better controlled.
- **REC 4.4** – Ric Balfour noted that this Objective should be reworded to include something like “trails to developed facilities” – that is, ADA standards shouldn’t be applied to non-developed areas (such as the majority of the perimeter trail).
- **REC 4.8** – The Group discussed the intent of this asterisked Objective, noting that it essentially proposes the construction of a separate trail for equestrian use.
- **REC 4.9** – George Dallas (landowner) noted that the resident landowners strongly object to having a gated access road (note – this is an asterisked Objective).

General Land Use Question – Herb Doumitt (OR Bass & Panfish Club) inquired about what became of the issue of providing a cell tower for commercial and emergency communication needs, requesting that it be added as a separate Objective. The Planning Team noted that citing a tower on non-Reclamation lands would be out of the agency’s jurisdiction, so the Objective would need to be phrased as “cooperate with...”

At this point in the meeting, John Petrovsky noted that we were behind schedule, and that the primary focus of the meeting was on discussing/refining the draft alternatives. It was decided to move on from the Goals & Objectives discussion; the Planning Team requested that any additional comments on the Goals & Objectives be submitted in writing. As of September 28, no additional comments have been received on the Goals & Objectives from AHWG members.

Elk Meadows Issue

Prior to shifting to the detailed discussion of alternatives, the AHWG addressed the current status of the elk meadows issue. Jim Keany summarized the status of the issue, noting that the Planning Team had met earlier in the day with ODFW and USFWS specifically to talk about the elk meadows. There are several areas in the park that WACO currently is mowing for the purpose of elk forage habitat. When the Planning Team started digging into the history of management requirements, it became clear that their origin was ambiguous; although the details are fuzzy, we do have a good idea of the spirit of the original management intent. Originally, the elk meadows were intended as mitigation lands for farmland flooding and dam building. According to the early documentation in a wildlife compensation plan, 140 acres should be maintained permanently as mitigation lands. The locations of these meadows, and specific acreages, have shifted over the years. Our current goal is to develop a management plan to meet the spirit of the original agreement, and this will be incorporated in the RMP process. At the minimum, at least 140 acres of elk meadows will be incorporated into each alternative. In addition, any development within those meadows will receive greater scrutiny. Ric Balfour (PUMP) noted that we shouldn’t let a 35-year old, potentially outdated management agreement drive the decision-making process. The RMP provides an opportunity to re-examine this issue and look at current data and habitat needs.

IV. RMP ALTERNATIVES

The primary goal of this meeting is to gather AHWG input on the drafted preliminary alternatives. To begin with, an exercise was conducted in the following manner: One set of the drafted alternatives table was enlarged to poster-size and hung on the wall. AHWG members were invited to mark their preference for individual alternative components (using bright markers); Group members were also encouraged to mark their preference for an individual alternative, if appropriate. This round of informal comment/input was focused on preferences for components (as opposed to opposition or disagreement). By consolidating preferences, the Planning Team hoped to composite a picture of components favored by a majority of the Group. (Note: this exercise was not intended as a voting process; it was designed to consolidate input to see if an overall pattern would emerge.)

Based on this exercise, the most evident observation is that it is impossible to generalize AHWG member preferences for any individual alternative, or even for individual components. In short, the comments received were “all over the map.” To illustrate this, a revised alternatives table is included as Attachment 1 that was reformatted to incorporate AHWG member preference marks for components, indicated with the symbol ▲. Multiple ▲’s indicated multiple Group members expressing their preference for this component. As evident from the reformatted alternatives table (Attachment 1), Group members expressed a preference for components in all alternatives (i.e., A, B, and C), with no overall pattern evident.

Two significant discussions ensued, as summarized below. First, a discussion was held clarifying the meaning of “No Action.” The No Action Alternative analysis is a requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), against which the effects of various “action” alternatives can be evaluated and compared. In this case, however, the term “No Action” is confusing as it does not imply the inability to implement management actions or the preservation of existing conditions. Rather, in the context of this RMP process, No Action refers to not developing a new RMP, and instead continuing existing management plans and actions as documented in the 1994 Recreation Plan. For example, the Recreation Plan documents the potential to reopen Recreation Area A East as a campground, with 70 overnight campsites; in this case, “No Action” would indicate significant changes to existing conditions.

The second discussion item was to clarify that the alternatives development process is ongoing. The alternatives will evolve, with additional opportunity for AHWG member (and other agency and public) input possible when the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) is out for a 45-day public review.

Following the group preference exercise described above, the remainder of the meeting was devoted to an opportunity for each AHWG member to express their individual concerns and reactions to the alternatives. Member-specific comments are summarized below (presented in the same order as presented). The Planning Team will use this specific input to reshape the preliminary alternatives.

Steve Seely – Washington County Parks & Recreation Advisory Board

An additional concern is the liability associated with play structures proposed in Recreation Area A East (under Alternative B). Steve reiterated the discussion about the elk meadows, stating that improved habitat management might contribute to increased elk usage, which may invite more poaching. Also, Steve noted that there is a strong demand and need for camping facilities in the county.

Wally Otto, Tualatin Valley Irrigation District

Wally stressed that if a campground were opened, adequate enforcement would be required to ensure safety, emergency services, and general police protection; such a management presence presents a significant funding issue. Another issue of importance is the security of the Reclamation (O&M) zone around the dam – public access will need to be restricted during certain times; for example, at the present time we are officially under Orange Alert. Finally, Wally stressed that water quality is a significant concern; as dam operator and representative for the contractors, we should take all possible measures to protect water quality (including such measures as erosion control and pollution protection/prevention).

Tom Wolf, Trout Unlimited & Tualatin River Watershed Council

Tom reiterated earlier comments that water quality is the top priority issue, noting that upstream watershed sources are very important to the watershed council. He emphasized that his constituents oppose camping, primarily for the reasons of law enforcement and water quality concerns. Finally, he addressed the issue of the elk meadows, stating that we have a responsibility to protect native flora and fauna; the elk are an important presence and their habitat needs to be protected. Additional comments that Tom provided on the alternatives table included: (1) an opposition to placing a coffer dam at Tanner Creek, and (2) feedback that he would be in favor of creating a separate equestrian trail if water quality concerns could be adequately addressed.

Don VandeBergh, ODFW

According to Don, ODFW at this time does not support camping; primary reasons include loss of habitat, concerns for water quality, and the potential for wildlife harassment, as well as sanitation, erosion, and impacts to local residents. An additional concern is the potential to exceed the carrying capacity of the park by adding additional facilities; in general, a capacity analysis should be conducted. Regarding the elk meadows issue, Don stressed that ODFW will be flexible; our goal is to develop a rational solution and the agency is open for discussion.

Andy Dyuck, WACO Board of Commissioners

Andy stressed that this area should not provide overnight camping facilities, primarily because of law enforcement logistics, as well as impacts to residents. Regarding the equestrian trail issue, he recommended not developing a separate trail; equestrian/bike usage can be compatible with adequate management.

George Dallas, Landowner (replacement for Julie Pratt)

George stated that one of the residents' main concern is that the park not become overdeveloped. We feel very strongly about development at the lake; although the residents obviously don't agree on all issues, there is a consensus to minimize overall development. The most important issue is camping, which the residents oppose. Negative impacts from camping would affect the residents the most, especially noise, fire hazard, and overall safety concerns. Other comments included the support for a non-motorized boat launch on the reservoir to attract users that have a limited impact. Most residents are opposed to equestrian use of the park because of water quality and wildlife conflicts; also, use levels are already very high and equestrian use would only bring in more people and cars (with trailers). George stressed that water quality is the priority, overarching issue of concern. Another important issue to residents is minimizing fire hazard and risk. Regarding law enforcement, George stated that increased police presence is necessary; he also cautioned that creating additional facilities would exacerbate the current lack of adequate enforcement. Finally, he stressed that the residents do not want to create a gated community. In his separate written comments on the table, he also noted a preference for no changes to the Scoggins Creek Picnic Area and Recreation Area C.

Chuck Kingston – Joint Water Commission

Chuck reiterated previous comments regarding water quality concerns; it is the overarching issue. Other issues the RMP should specifically address include: (1) the control of invasive bivalves (such as zebra mussels), and (2) security/access (i.e., Homeland Security). In his separately submitted written comments on the table, he added the following components: (1) a new boat washing/inspection facility, and (2) a fee station with a security person to identify potential threats (such as chemicals or terrorists).

Ray Wold, Oregon Equestrian Trails

Ray commented primarily on equestrian use of the park, as well as the potential campground. Regarding horse use, he noted that equestrian use is incorporated into most new and existing state/national parks (e.g., Tillamook). It is frustrating that horses aren't allowed at Henry Hagg, close to where Ray lives. A separate trail would be preferable to minimize user conflicts, but he noted that joint-use trails have worked well in other locations. Ray also stressed that a campground is a needed resource in Washington County; we need local campsites, and the facilities already exist at Henry Hagg. The concerns raised could be addressed by proper design and management.

Jim Olson, Mazamas

Stating that his interest is primarily birds, Jim noted that wetland enhancement would improve avian habitat and protect water quality. He also mentioned retaining snags in the area for eagle use.

Gary Myers, NW Outdoor Learning Center

Gary's primary concern is that the Learning Center proceed as planned, noting that by design it is intended to be a "green," sustainable facility dedicated to environmental education. Apart from the Center, he stressed that development at the park should be minimized, and that paving should be used as little as possible; permeable surfaces should be used to protect water quality. Finally, Gary opposes opening the campground for all of the reasons previously stated.

Herb Doumitt, Oregon Bass & Panfish Club

Herb addressed two main concerns. First, his group very much opposes camping; recreational use is already high at the park and we don't want to attract even more people and introduce additional social conflict. Secondly, he opposes the use of a cofferdam; concerns include safety (it would be a boating hazard), aesthetics, and siltation.

Scott Diamond, Roadrunners

Scott commented that the alternatives do not present a logical pattern – they seem to be all over the map. Regarding campground development, he noted that the AHWG does not include membership of campers; similarly, boating interests are under-represented. There is a real need for camping facilities in the area, and all of the concerns about negative camping impacts could be addressed by site design, enforcement, and management (such as revenue, noise/disturbance, etc.). Regarding equestrian use, a joint-use trail would be feasible, but he noted bridge improvements would be required prior to horse use.

Kathi Larson, USFWS

The USFWS does not support opening the campground. We would support equestrian use of the trail only if impacts could be adequately mitigated (especially wildlife and water quality concerns). Regarding the elk meadows, we recommend that at least 140 acres of mitigation lands be provided, as well as the development of an overall management plan.

Ric Balfour, PUMP

Ric commented specifically on the camping, joint-use trail issues, development at Recreation Area C, and presence of the Environmental Learning Center. Regarding camping, he noted that WACO lacks any camping facilities despite the increasing need. Similar issues were present at Tillamook and such concerns have been adequately addressed by design and management (e.g., the presence of a camphost). If camping were included, one issue to examine would be the number of RV sites provided. Also, the density and number of sites would be a concern; Alternative A provides a cluster of high-end development that could be pared down to a less intensive camping experience. Regarding trails, he noted that current trail use is already getting to be busy (especially for mountain bikers). Considerable modifications would be required to safely accommodate horses. Sharing the trail would invite user conflicts; overall, he wouldn't recommend equestrian use. Regarding Recreation Area C, he supports the provision of a non-motorized boat launch, which would reduce boating conflicts. It would also be a good idea to designate a non-motorized portion of the reservoir surface, which would have added water quality and wildlife benefits. The associated alternative components could be split out from the more intensive development (such as picnic tables). Ric supports the development of an Environmental Learning Center, noting that its presence and use are compatible with elk habitat. In Ric's separately submitted comments on the alternatives table, he recommended paring back many of the potential developments, such as parking, disc-golf course, parking spaces, etc. In addition, he recommended scaling back the elk meadow management actions.

Tom VanderPlatt, Clean Water Services

Tom noted that there would be no impact to water quality from changes in water storage capacity. He is opposed to opening the campground, primarily because of water quality concerns. In his separately submitted written comments on the table, he recommended no changes to the Scoggins Creek Picnic Area or Recreation Area C. In addition, the RMP should address the long-term management and rehabilitation/maintenance of the elk meadows.

Misc./Anonymous Comments

An anonymous comment was received on the alternatives table, recommending that the Preferred Alternative examine the possibility of re-establishing salmon runs in the watershed; a fish ladder could be constructed at the dam, and overall habitat improvements upstream of the dam/reservoir could be considered.

VI. CLOSING/WRAP-UP

John Petrovsky noted that we can't expect a consensus on some of these issues; there are tradeoffs that occur with such management decisions, and the Planning Team will have to work to provide a balance. Based on AHWG input from today, the alternatives will evolve significantly. The next opportunity for AHWG review of the alternatives will be when the Draft EA is released, currently scheduled for May 2003. A public meeting will be held in May, and an AHWG will be scheduled for June. To ensure that the Group stays adequately informed during this lengthy gap, the Planning Team will communicate regularly via letters and e-mail; also check the website for periodic updates.

The meeting was adjourned at 9 p.m.

-End-

Attachment 1
Consolidated Comments on the Alternatives Table
(Preferences as Expressed by the AHWG)